UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1992/20
3 March 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-ninth session
4-29 May 1992, Geneva
Item 5 of the provisional agenda

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

EVALUATION

Report of the Administrator

SUMMARY

This is the ninth report responding to Governing Council decision 83/12 which requested information on the arrangements for the evaluation of the programme.

The report not only covers the principal evaluation issues that emerged during 1991 but also reviews the work of the Central Evaluation Office over the whole of the fourth cycle.

The report considers the evolving role of evaluation in the United Nations Development Programme over the last five years (section II); summarizes the major evaluation work carried out in 1991 and the issues emerging from that work (section III); discusses the feedback of evaluation results into the work of UNDP (section IV); records what has been done to promote national monitoring and evaluation systems (section V); contains an account of other evaluation work (section VI); discusses collaboration with other institutions (section VII); and finally lays out the 1992/1993 work programme (section VIII).

The attention of the Governing Council members is drawn to reports of programme achievements by Regional Directors for their respective regions with regard to any specific evaluation activities conducted by them.

92-09790 3690a (E) 250392 270392

/...

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The present annual report on evaluation is the ninth since the establishment of the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) in 1983. It not only covers the principal evaluation issues that emerged during 1991 but also reviews the work of CEO over the whole of the fourth cycle. Thus, a number of significant issues are addressed in a wider context.

2. The report indicates the changing role of evaluation as part of the larger process of refocusing the attention of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on issues of development policy and on creating national capacity in support of sustainable human development. Section II considers the evolving role of evaluation in UNDP over the last five years. Section III summarizes the major evaluation work carried out in 1991 and the issues emerging from that work. Section IV discusses the feedback of evaluation results into the work of UNDP. Section V records what has been done to promote national monitoring and evaluation systems while section VI contains an account of other evaluation work. Section VII discusses collaboration with other institutions, Governments and United Nations specialized agencies. Section VIII lays out the plans that CEO has drawn up for change in the nature of CEO work foreseen for the fifth cycle.

II. EVOLVING ROLE OF THE CENTRAL EVALUATION OFFICE OF UNDP

3. Over the past five years, the main foci of CEO work were revision of the monitoring and evaluation system of UNDP, programme analysis and feedback of results into UNDP operations and strengthening of national monitoring and evaluation systems.

4. System revision. In revising the system, CEO sought to increase its focus on results, at both the programme and project levels. Another goal was to produce a simplified and harmonized approach to evaluation capable of being easily applied by both Governments and United Nations agencies concerned. Evaluation reports received by the CEO over these five years show a distinct trend towards an emphasis on results at both the formulation and evaluation stages of projects. The evaluation of mid-term reviews of country programmes reported on to the Governing Council at its thirty-seventh meeting (1990) indicated that this trend is less evident at the programme level as management considerations rather than impact remain the main focus of these reviews. The currently established monitoring and evaluation system, last revised in 1987, is now generally perceived by the members of the tripartite system to be a significant improvement over the earlier arrangements.

5. Evaluation in the context of UNDP. Evaluation is now well accepted as an instrument of management and accountability at the project level. It continues to provide information and analysis which assist project management in making adjustments at the mid-term stage of project implementation. In turn the findings of terminal evaluations are relevant to defining follow-up phases of assistance. At the level of UNDP programmes such as national

technical cooperation assessments and programmes (NATCAPs) and structural dimensions of adjustment (SDA), evaluations increasingly looked to impact and relevance of policy, for fine-tuning ongoing activities and adjusting newly launched initiatives.

6. An effective and independent evaluation function is to promote the confidence of contributing Governments in the effectiveness and impact of UNDP technical cooperation programmes. CEO has over the last few years been increasingly able to operate with the independence needed to carry out objective evaluation work. The continuing support and interest of the Governing Council in CEO work is a positive factor in ensuring the impact of evaluations on UNDP activities.

7. Institutional memory. This is an area where a five-year retrospective offers both a sense of achievement and a challenge for the future. The first steps have been taken to move beyond oral history to a functional computerized institutional memory. A central evaluation database (CEDAB) was established in 1987. It contains the analysed results of project evaluations. At the end of 1991, CEDAB contained the results of 750 evaluation reports. Further details of CEDAB are provided in chapter IV. CEDAB data are available via computer network, to all operational staff of UNDP headquarters and when the necessary technology systems are in place, to all field offices. The quality of project evaluations was a major constraint at the inception of the system. However, a perceived improvement in the quality and the increasing number of reports processed into the database over the years have been instrumental in validating the relevance of the information in CEDAB. CEDAB has increasingly become a source of lessons pertinent to the direction and management of UNDP efforts in a growing number of sectors or themes, as reflected in chapter IV of this report. Also, the Action Committee, established in 1986 to consider programme and project proposals for approval, has since 1990 provided an opportunity for CEO to introduce findings and lessons with a view to improving formulation and design aspects.

8. Feedback. Substantive feedback has been provided and continues to be provided to concerned UNDP staff at both headquarters and in the field. The principal instruments have been staff training and the evaluation summaries conveyed in a range of publication series called "FINDINGS", "FEEDBACK", CEO Occasional Papers and CEO Evaluation Studies.

9. Demand-driven approach. Efforts are made for evaluation activities to respond to specific demands to ensure that ownership of the evaluation process lies with those responsible for applying the lessons of evaluations. This linkage with operations also reduces the risk of CEO becoming too academic. Requests from donors, recipient Governments, the Governing Council and the Senior Management and Regional Bureaux of UNDP for evaluation activities involving CEO continue to grow. In the case of the Regional Bureaux, evaluation activities continue to be funded from indicative planning figure (IPF) resources.

10. National monitoring and evaluation capacity. Monitoring and evaluation systems of Governments continue to be a missing element in a comprehensive approach to the strengthening of national capacities for the management of development resources. This issue has become an important topic of concern to interested donor and recipient Governments alike. Subsequent to General Assembly resolution 38/171 which, inter alia, called for support for national monitoring and evaluation systems and CEO production of national monitoring and evaluation monographs, the issue has became an increasingly important item on the agenda of both the DAC/OECD and the World Bank. UNDP is now recognized by donors as one of the leading organizations engaged in the strengthening of national monitoring and evaluation capacities in recipient countries.

11. Given its limited resources, the approach adopted by CEO has been to facilitate the exchange of information about the different systems in place in developing countries, leaving further follow-up action to be pursued under the framework of country programmes with IPF funds. National monographs, describing how countries collect, analyse and use qualitative and quantitative information about their own development, have been produced for the following countries: Côte d'Ivoire, India, Malaysia, Morocco, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

12. UNDP programme analysis. Much of the initial work undertaken by CEO in the area of programme analysis was modelled on earlier thematic evaluations of selected sectoral topics. Evaluations on topics such as rural small industrial enterprises in 1988 in collaboration with the Government of the Netherlands, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and aquaculture in 1987 in collaboration with the Government of Norway and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) were well received.

13. The increasing interest in evaluation activities manifested by the Governing Council is reflected in completed evaluations led or supported by CEO and requested by the Council on national execution, the United Nations Volunteers programme (UNV), aid coordination capacity in least developed countries (LDCs), SDA and the ongoing evaluation of the Senior Economist Programme in Africa. The evaluations of aid coordination capacity in LDCs and SDA in Africa have both led to specific Council decisions requesting implementation of the recommendations of these evaluations.

14. The Senior Management and the Regional Bureaux of UNDP have requested CEO to manage or be associated with the evaluations in the following areas: Special Industrial Services (SIS) programme; sectoral support; NATCAPs; development planning; Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals (TOKTEN); research and development institutions in India and China; technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC); SDA and mid-term reviews of country programmes. Programme managers continue to make significant use of the findings and recommendations of these evaluations.

15. CEO in the fifth programming cycle. On the basis of paragraph 22 of Governing Council decision 91/46 of 21 June 1991, which requested the Administrator "to reassess, in the context of his proposed workload study, the technical capacity of the Central Evaluation Office with a view to strengthening the Office within the proposed budget total", CEO undertook a strategic planning exercise for the fifth cycle period. The exercise was based on the progress made in incorporating evaluation into the "culture" of UNDP, the level of the current evaluation capacity in the organization and took into account the new factors shaping the future role of UNDP and the guidance provided by General Assembly resolutions 44/211 of 22 December 1989 and 46/218 of 20 December 1991 on operational activities for development and Governing Council decision 90/34 of 23 June 1990 relating to capacity-building in the six areas of focus, the programme approach and national execution.

16. Focus. The CEO strategic planning exercise recommended a scenario where programme evaluation would initially dominate, with increasing attention being paid to the evaluation of UNDP strategy and policy by the end of the fifth cycle. This scenario suggested the strengthening of CEO to undertake policy, strategy and programme (i.e., thematic) evaluations and to back-stop evaluation capacity in the Regional Bureaux at the level of country programme and project evaluations.

17. Monitoring and evaluation system. In the past, UNDP has used projects more commonly as the principal vehicle for delivering its technical cooperation programme. Currently, in order to support adoption of the programme approach, UNDP will need to diversify the means through which it can effectively deliver its support. This in turn gives rise to a new set of issues. Projects are discrete in terms of objectives, resources and time frames. It has therefore been relatively easy to assess progress and achievements at the end of each project and to search for impact for some time thereafter. UNDP support to national programmes is a more complex consideration. Such support is larger and takes longer; indeed, it is often continuous. To be able to focus on development goals through the support of national programmes offers greater potential impact. However, in order to achieve this greater impact, a comprehensive process of programme formulation is needed, including the collection of baseline data and specification of performance indicators. This is followed, during the programme implementation stage, by a periodic assessment of the development of the national programme and the relevance of UNDP support to this programme, which is fed back into programme management. There is, therefore, much to be done to develop a modified methodology for the monitoring and evaluation of UNDP cooperation in national programmes in order to assess progress, impact and performance and develop an early warning system for programme managers and decision makers.

18. UNDP should continue to develop a comprehensive evaluation system that supports both the accountability of the Administrator for the quality of UNDP technical cooperation and offers effective feedback to all levels of national and international management. Also, to be consistent with decentralization, the evaluation system should facilitate management by strategy and policy rather than by detailed centralized decision-making about operations.

Modifying the existing monitoring and evaluation system should take into account the promotion of national implementation. Specific guidelines for the evaluation of UNDP efforts to strengthen national capacity-building in the six thematic areas of focus will also be required.

19. Thematic and sectoral reviews. CEO will continue to carry out thematic and sectoral evaluations. These will include evaluation of UNDP specific programmes, activities in the six thematic areas of focus and programmes funded under the Special Programme Resources (SPR).

20. Feedback. Dissemination of lessons will be enhanced through the preparation of information material and access to data (reports, publications, access to CEDAB). In addition, the database will be expanded to include country programme evaluations and project terminal reports. The extended coverage of CEDAB will allow for sectoral and thematic analysis not only from data extracted from project evaluation and terminal reports but also from information provided by programme reviews and evaluations.

21. National monitoring and evaluation capacity. CEO will continue to build on its national monograph series, to train national counterparts, to facilitate the exchange of experience on evaluation between interested Governments, and to provide advisory services in strengthening and designing national monitoring and evaluation systems such as those in Morocco and Brazil. CEO will also pursue its efforts to develop its capacity as one of the leading organizations in this field.

III. MAJOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES IN 1991

A. Evaluations of institution-building projects

22. High tech in India and China. At the request of the Action Committee, CEO examined UNDP support to the development of high technology institutions in India and China. The evaluation reviewed 32 projects assisting 15 institutions which have received a total of $64 million of UNDP assistance over a period of 15 years. The findings are as follows:

(a) Technology transfer and absorption: most UNDP projects succeeded in establishing and/or strengthening the 15 institutions reviewed;

(b) Linkages with the productive and the educational sectors: in most cases the technology acquired and/or developed was not disseminated to users in the productive sector. The lack of linkages between research and development institutions and the productive and educational sectors created dependency on foreign know-how, promoted brain drain (from India) and did not encourage indigenous innovation. China's recent policy of eliminating public funding for research and development institutions has encouraged the creation of linkages with the productive sectors;

(c) Demand for technology: the lack of substantial demand by enterprises for locally developed technology remains a serious problem. Government protection of the domestic market and the lack of incentives in both countries do not stimulate competition and demand for such technology;

(d) Sustainability of results: most of the Indian institutions do not have any prospect of becoming financially self-sustaining in the foreseeable future. In China, the termination of public funding has obliged research and development institutions to become more self-sustaining;

(e) Maintenance of technological state of the art: research and development institutions will not be able to keep up with the rapid technological changes in the world if adequate foreign exchange is not made available to them to receive publications and participate in international conferences;

(f) Women, environmental impact and the private sector: UNDP assistance was considered to be gender neutral, although the expansion of research and development facilities allowed for the greater participation of women in the highly skilled work force areas. Some projects minimized environmental degradation. They had little impact on private sector development;

(g) UNDP's comparative advantages: UNDP has unique capabilities in obtaining access to private sources of technology, building institutional linkages between developing and developed country institutions and providing integrated access to high technology. The evaluation considered that UNDP has no comparative advantage in equipment purchase. UNDP should instead focus on continuing to support the transfer of existing technologies or the development and acquisition of new technologies.

23. The Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific, after determining the views of the Governments of India and China on the evaluation report, is expected to engage in a dialogue with the national counterpart institutions, at the policy level, to enhance the downstream impact of technology projects and programmes from the formulation stage. The lessons deriving from this evaluation will also be used as an input to the development of UNDP strategy in capacity-building for the transfer of technology.

24. Environmental study centres in Indonesia. The Environmental Management Act (1982) of Indonesia established the legal framework within which the central and provincial governments are obliged to cooperate in managing the rich natural resources of the country. One element of the strategy was the establishment of environmental study centres as distinct institutes within Indonesia's universities. The intellectual resources of the universities were to be drawn on to provide these centres with the required capacities for inter-disciplinary environmental research, training and policy advice. Each centre was expected to specialize in specific aspects of environmental research based on the unique natural resources of each province.

25. In the period 1982-1989, two successive UNDP projects, a total cost of $2.5 million (including a cost-sharing contribution of $550,000 from the Government of Indonesia) were implemented by the World Bank to develop 7 selected centres, out of a total of 50, as centres of excellence for environmental research, training and policy advice.

26. Definitions of environmental research tasks in the centres were not established at the inception of the programme. The evaluation found no clear evidence that the concerned institutions were adequately consulted, prior to the initiation of the projects, on the specific obligations required of them to act as counterpart institutions.

27. The projects were not considered to be cost-effective. Local intellectual input was neglected, particularly at the universities in Java, which the project was expected to mobilize and there was a corresponding over-reliance on expatriate resident advisers. The Government was unable to meet its contributions to finance research activities in view of the economic difficulties they faced at the time.

28. Since the projects evolved more as direct support to the institutions, institution-building itself became a subsidiary concern. The most tangible results are to be seen in the training of 60 academic personnel at the MSc level and in the equipping of laboratories and libraries.

29. In a few of the environmental study centres, an attempt was made to develop research agendas but these were not implemented as Government's funding was not forthcoming. The advisory relationship with the provincial governments did not develop as planned, and dialogue on environmental research between the centres and the provincial governments failed to materialize since this kind of research relationship was a completely new area for both parties. However, a constructive relationship did emerge between the centres and the provincial governments in training and consultancy services, which were essential to the latter in managing environmental legislation. It was expected that this relationship will later expand to encompass relevant environmental research. Very little contact was facilitated with other Indonesian environmental study centres that already possessed extensive resources. Attempts were made to establish twinning arrangements with foreign universities but this did not lead to any enduring relationships.

30. Disaster and development. A recent evaluation examined how disaster and development are related through the UNDP contribution towards disaster mitigation efforts in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Ecuador. From these three country case-studies findings were derived for UNDP on how it may better support Governments in this critical area. The study found that Governments are willing to develop long-term strategies while the recollection of a recent disaster is still fresh but long-term orientation is lost as memory fades. Where efforts have been made at disaster preparedness, emphasis has often been placed on stockpiling and developing emergency response plans rather than on institutional strengthening. Moreover, Governments do not always recognize that disaster mitigation may be carried out at low cost by adjusting ongoing

development programmes. The study also found that independent measures taken by donors to bypass national structures are often undertaken in haste and are not always comprehensive in responding to disaster mitigation requirements. In many cases, Governments have been reluctant to use the expertise and support potentially available from non-governmental organizations and the private sector. Moreover, national relief agencies do not always want to yield leadership in disaster mitigation even where their institutional framework and resources may not be appropriate for the broader role of integrating development concerns with disaster-related issues.

B. Other major evaluations with a capacity-building component

31. Other major evaluations which were carried out in 1990-1991 were Aid coordinations in least developed countries (LDCs), Social Dimension of Adjustment in Africa and NATCAPs. The results of these initiatives were earlier reported on to the Governing Council at its thirty-eighth session (1991).

C. Cross-cutting issues emerging from the evaluations

32. Two significant cross-cutting issues emerge from these major evaluations.

33. A strategic approach to strengthening national capacity. The evaluations confirm the need for UNDP to develop an integrated conceptual framework, as requested by the Governing Council in its decision 91/26, for establishing and strengthening national capacity. UNDP has initiated preliminary work on such a framework that is expected, inter alia, to identify the basic capacities to be strengthened. These include: capacities to define and manage a long-term vision as well as the capacities to formulate and manage the resulting development policies and programmes, including monitoring and evaluation.

34. Evaluations of institutions have provided a larger perspective than traditional project evaluations for recipient Governments and UNDP. These have not been limited to assessing the UNDP contribution to these institutions but have covered the evaluation of the performance and impact of the institutions themselves. Relevance of policies and the contribution to national programmes were considered the critical issues in these evaluations. The wider utilization of the institutional evaluation modality can provide the basis for a dialogue with recipient countries on the relevance of current policies and institutions and on areas where UNDP assistance could be the most effective.

35. Substantive capacity within UNDP. All these evaluations indicate the need for strengthened substantive capacity in UNDP to address basic development issues and to undertake a policy dialogue with Governments.

36. This requires in particular a comprehensive institutional and socio-economic understanding of how technical cooperation can effectively contribute to support national development programmes, human development and capacity-building. This also presupposes an effective capacity to handle development issues and to be able to analyse lessons of experience and feed them back into operational settings. The issue of the substantive capacity of UNDP is being considered as part of the work on a strategic approach to strengthening national capacity.

D. Participatory evaluation

37. CEO is currently examining the extent to which participatory evaluation approaches, i.e., evaluation conducted by beneficiaries of a project assistance, may be integrated into the existing evaluation system. The first of several planned case-studies was carried out in the Southern Province of Zambia from April to July 1991, with the objective of determining the strengths and benefits of the participatory process as part of the evaluation modality.

38. In the first case-study concerning a post-harvest losses project, the beneficiaries themselves identified a number of problems relating to food security: the delayed receipt of fertilizers and seed; low prices for maize; delayed payment for produce sold; transportation problems; loss of cattle from disease; post-harvest losses; lack of agro-chemicals; and land and water problems. The communities discussed these issues, defined options and selected corrective actions for each problem area and committed themselves to implementing the proposed solutions.

39. The limitation of the methodology is that it requires a considerable amount of time and flexibility to ensure that the target community is able to participate in the exercise with minimum disruption to their routine activities. It also imposes an extra burden on those responsible for making the logistical arrangements since these measures cannot be processed centrally. It is also more vulnerable to local contingencies than other evaluation methodologies. In follow-up case-studies, CEO expects to sharpen the evaluation process by selecting projects at the mid-term stage, by providing for the closer association of beneficiaries and by testing different evaluation methods.

IV. FEEDBACK OF EVALUATION RESULTS INTO THE WORK OF UNDP

40. Project evaluation reports. CEO has received the number of project evaluation reports shown below during the last five years. Out of these 859 evaluation reports, 750 have been processed by CEO and entered into CEDAB.

Type of evaluation	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Mid-term	54	52	68	129	69
Terminal	97	92	110	99	58
Ex-post	9	5	7	6	3
Total	160	149	185	234	130
Cluster	2	4	9	6	2

41. The figures for 1991 are subject to upward revision as some evaluation reports completed late in the year may not have been received by CEO at the time of preparation of the present report.

42. Some 200 evaluations continue to be performed annually. While terminal evaluations used to be more common, in 1991 there was a perceptible continuation of the trend noted in 1990 and mid-term project evaluations now account for about 60 per cent of the total.

43. The number of cluster evaluations remains low. As such exercises are a cost-effective means of covering several associated projects through a single evaluation, thereby facilitating programme level assessments, CEO continues to recommend greater use of this modality.

44. Quality of projects and of evaluations. The evaluation findings for 546 projects in the CEO evaluation database covering the period 1985-1990 have been analysed with respect to adequacy of design and performance. The findings are as follows:

(a) 68 per cent of projects were adequately designed;

(b) 35 per cent of projects were successful and 59 per cent partially successful when assessed against overall objectives;

(c) 80 per cent of the evaluation reports may be considered good to satisfactory in the sense that they have provided sufficient data for a fair assessment of projects and to substantiate the proposed recommendations.

45. In terms of trends, the data available suggest a modest improvement in overall performance at the project level. CEO will continue to monitor these trends and assess any significant changes introduced through the support of the programme approach and the expansion of the national execution modality.

46. Thematic and sectoral analysis derived from project evaluation reports. Provision of more timely feedback to the staff involved in the formulation stage will be reinforced with data available in CEDAB. There is now sufficient data entered in CEDAB to permit CEO to draw certain thematic and sectoral conclusions. The preliminary results of such analyses are as follows.

Development planning

47. This analysis, requested by the Action Committee on 19 September 1990, was based on 33 evaluation reports recorded in this sector and available in CEDAB. The analysis confirmed the conclusions of earlier reviews of UNDP assistance for planning projects, which were carried out in 1979 and 1987. UNDP assistance has fallen far short of creating self-reliance in development planning. However, many intermediate objectives have been met. The preparation of medium-term plans, sector studies, advice on sectoral policy issues, and the training of nationals in planning methodology, macroeconomic analysis, project selection and monitoring have been successful.

48. The review indicated that recipient Governments need to be committed to making their planning agencies central to the decision-making process. Coordination between planning, finance and relevant sectoral ministries also needs strengthening. Political stability was considered essential to raising the level of competence in public service and to facilitating the development of sustainable national institutions.

49. Public participation (grass-roots, private and non-monetary sectors of the economy) in development planning was considered essential, as well as the availability of a minimal level of socio-economic data. When the share of foreign assistance in a plan was above a certain threshold, the review considered that there was too much emphasis given to aid coordination and fund-raising activities and not enough to the management of the development resources.

50. Planners also need feedback from implementation. Consequently, planning assistance should routinely include strengthening of the monitoring and evaluation system.

National execution

51. A review of 40 evaluations of nationally executed projects recorded in CEDAB found that most of them were successful or partially successful upon completion. The most tangible contribution of these projects was the strengthening of national capacities in science and technology, agriculture, and industry.

52. Most projects were satisfactorily designed. However, a number of others were weak in planning activities, identifying indicators of project success, and defining the institutional arrangements. In successful cases, the national implementing agency had a certain level of experience in technical cooperation projects and UNDP procedures and was thus able to use this modality efficiently.

53. There has been a tendency to rely on government agencies alone in project execution. National execution should not be limited to government agencies but should involve also the private sector and NGOs. Where they have been involved, United Nations specialized agencies proved to be useful in gaining

access to international or global expertise and resources, particularly in hiring consultants and in the selection of training institutions. Further involvement of specialized agencies of the United Nations system should be considered at the early stages of project design.

Agricultural development and support services

54. An analysis of the evaluations of 55 agricultural development and support services projects confirmed the findings of earlier reviews in this sector. Sustainability of project outputs leaves much to be desired. Three projects were deemed fully successful. Some of the factors which contributed to these successes were: a combination of a high degree of participation by the target group; dedicated and well-trained project personnel; appropriate technology; systematic project preparation; a professional and efficient management team; and an adequate and flexible training component.

55. Fifty-two projects were less than fully successful in that institutions failed to function after project completion, equipment was not being properly used, training programmes had not reached the target group or communication between project and the target group was less than desirable. The following were some of the main constraints identified by the analysis:

(a) Overly ambitious: expected project outputs were too ambitious considering their time-frame and the social and economic processes involved;

(b) Absence of participatory approach: the target group was not involved in the design of the project, resulting in a less-than-accurate identification of problems and a lack of the necessary support and participation at the community level;

(c) Absence of incentives: production incentives were not put in place. Moreover, the lack of marketing possibilities was a significant reason why farmers did not initiate or bother to sustain agricultural production;

(d) Inadequate extension at the field level;

(e) Inappropriate technology: failure to make use of appropriate technologies with resulting problems for adaptation as well as non-availability of spare parts;

(f) Inadequate evaluation feedback: inadequate use of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms during project implementation, which led to mistakes and constraints being detected too late or not at all.

Ex-post evaluations

56. An analysis was made of 18 ex-post evaluations of projects in a variety of sectors. This review was intended to assess the impact and sustainability of results.

57. The assessment of impact was generally at their qualitative level, primarily because of the absence of baseline data and indicators of success in project design. The inability of a few projects to generate the desired impact was attributed to: deficiencies in policies; overly ambitious targets; inappropriate technical approaches; and poor linkages between research, training and the transfer of technology.

58. The sustainability of results was related to the availability of adequate macroeconomic policies, the relevance of projects to target groups and the financial sustainability of the concerned institutions.

Conclusions derived from CEDAB-based reviews

59. The reviews underline the importance of placing UNDP technical cooperation activities in the context of national programmes. Thus, while projects may be successful in terms of their stated objective, their actual impact is very much a function of the larger national policy and programme environment within which they operate.

60. The reviews demonstrate that project-level evaluations may be analysed in volume and useful lessons drawn from this consolidation.

61. Gender issues as well as environmental concerns are generally lacking in the evaluation reports reviewed, particularly in the area of ex-post evaluations. CEO has started to address these issues through training its staff and further developing the existing monitoring and evaluation guidelines.

62. Summaries of the CEDAB-based analysis are being disseminated in a series of short papers entitled "FEEDBACK", initiated in October 1991 and made widely available to UNDP, concerned national and United Nations system staff as well as members of the Governing Council.

V. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION CAPACITY

63. Monographs for Sri Lanka and India were produced and finalized in the last quarter of 1991. These will contribute to a forthcoming seminar organized by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (DAC/OECD) and the Asian Development Bank in Kuala Lumpur in May 1992. Representatives of concerned Governments both from the region and from the donor community are expected to attend.

VI. OTHER EVALUATION WORK

64. The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO). Four evaluations were carried out in 1991: two in agro-forestry (in Burkina Faso and Niger); one in lake rehabilitation for agricultural production; and one in Mali and in Gambia on the development of improved cooking stoves.

65. With regard to both projects in agroforestry, it was recommended that the participation of beneficiaries be promoted in line with the UNSO emphasis on participatory development. In the case of Burkina Faso, it was recommended to concentrate the efforts in a few areas in order to develop effective techniques before their further dissemination. The evaluation of the cooking stove project marked the termination of UNSO activities in this field in the Gambia as promotional activities have been since transferred to the Department of Community Development. UNSO also assisted the UNDP field office in Senegal in the evaluation of the fourth country programme.

66. The evaluation activities of other funds, including the United Nations Capital Development Fund and the United Nations Development Fund for Women, will be reported to the Governing Council in their individual biennial reports.

VII. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

67. The development of professional relationships with the other evaluation services of both bilateral and multilateral agencies is a feature of the last five years of CEO work. Joint evaluations have in the past been undertaken with the Governments of Japan, Germany, Netherlands and Norway. Future collaboration is planned with the Governments of Australia and the United States. Similarly, CEO continues to participate in and benefit from the professional debates of the DAC/OECD Expert Group on Evaluation and the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG), including the exchange of experience on evaluation issues in both process and substantive areas.

68. The promotion by the DAC/OECD Expert Group on Evaluation of joint and concurrent evaluations at different levels (programme, sector, theme and country) has provided opportunities for CEO to continue and develop its association with evaluators in the donor community. Joint evaluations carried out with the evaluation services of developing countries have not yet occurred; CEO will continue to pursue this objective actively during the fifth cycle.

69. IAWG last met in Geneva in March 1991 to discuss issues of mutual concern. The role of the United Nations agencies in the evaluation of country programmes and nationally executed projects was addressed, as was the evaluation of headquarters programmes. The Joint Inspection Unit also took on active part in this meeting. The next IAWG annual meeting, scheduled for March 1992, is expected to focus on feed-back of lessons into programmes and projects, the use of the project evaluation database and gender issues in evaluation.

VIII. WORK PLAN FOR 1992-1993

70. The work plan is presented for the biennium 1992-1993, as requested by members of the Governing Council during the thirty-eighth session. This work plan is consistent with the activities related to evaluation and funded under SPR, as presented in document DP/1992/7.

CEO WORK PLAN 1992-1993

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
CORPORATE GOALS		
1. Evaluation activities related to UNDP areas of focus		
1.1 Evaluation activities related globally to the areas of focus	1.1.1 Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of the six areas of focus at the global and country levels	1992
1.2 Evaluation activities related to a specific area of focus		
1.2.1 Poverty eradication and grass-roots participation in development	1.2.1.1 One case study on participatory evaluation	1992
	1.2.1.2 Specific aspects of participatory evaluation to be included in the general guidelines	1992
	1.2.1.3 Review of participatory evaluation reports	1993
	1.2.1.4 Assessment of UNDP technical cooperation impact in the fourth cycle on poverty eradication	1992
	1.2.1.5 Contribution to the DAC expert group on evaluation on poverty eradication	1992
	1.2.1.6 Contribution to the DAC expert group on evaluation on NGO activities	1992
	1.2.1.7 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
1.2.2 Environmental problems and natural resource management	1.2.2.1 Cluster projects evaluation in one East European Country (energy and environment)	1992

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
	1.2.2.2 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
1.2.3 Management development		
Monitoring and evaluation	1.2.3.1 Country study reports on national capacity in monitoring and evaluation: Vietnam, Brazil, Guinea and five other countries	1992/93
	1.2.3.2 Advisory Services for Morocco	1992
	1.2.3.3 Synthesis of monographs for Asian countries (DAC seminar in Kuala Lumpur)	1992
	1.2.3.4 Study Tour for Guinea and Brazil	1992
	1.2.3.5 Study Tours for two other countries	1993
National execution	1.2.3.6 Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation for nationally executed projects	1992
	1.2.3.7 Training courses in monitoring and evaluation	1992/93
Programme approach	1.2.3.8 Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation	1992
Capacity-building	1.2.3.9 New guidelines for monitoring and evaluation for capacity-building, including institution-building	1992
	1.2.3.10 Contribution to DAC expert group on evaluation	1993
	1.2.3.11 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
1.2.4 Technical cooperation among developing countries	1.2.4.1 Directory of monitoring and evaluation central authorities incorporated in TCDC-INRES	1992
	1.2.4.2 Support for TCDC between Morocco and Guinea in monitoring and evaluation	1992
	1.2.4.3 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
1.2.5 Transfer of technology	1.2.5.1 Report on UNDP experience in LDCs	1993
	1.2.5.2 Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of projects related to transfer of technology	1992
	1.2.5.3 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
1.2.6 Women in development	1.2.6.1 Case studies in ex-post and participatory evaluations	1992

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
	1.2.6.2 Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation	1992
	1.2.6.3 Evaluation report of SPR-funded activities	1993
PROGRAMME GOALS		
2. Evaluation activities related to effectiveness and efficiency of programming and programme quality		
2.1 Evaluation activities related to cost-effectiveness	2.1.1 Issues paper and case studies on cost-effectiveness of technical cooperation	1993
2.2 Efficiency of programming	2.2.1 Contribution to report to Governing Council on efficiency of programming	1993
2.3 Country programme evaluations	2.3.1 Two case studies	1992
	2.3.2 Guidelines	1993
2.4 Project impact evaluations	2.4.1 Eight ex-post project impact evaluations	1992/93
2.5 Action Committee/PAC impact	2.5.1 Assessment report	1993
3. Other programme, policy and process evaluations		
3.1 Disaster and Development	3.1.1 Impact of Humanitarian Programme	1993
	3.1.2 Institutional memory	1992
	3.1.3 Training of UNDP staff by CEO	1992/93
3.2 Aid coordination in LDCs	3.2.1 Contribution to report to Governing Council	1992
3.3 Support costs	3.3.1 Design of monitoring and evaluation system	1992
3.4 Sectoral support	3.4.1 Contribution to report to Governing Council	1993
3.5 UNCDF feedback system	3.5.1 Contribution to report to Governing Council	1992
3.6 Senior Management Structure	3.6.1 Contribution to report to Governing Council	1992
3.7 Monitoring and evaluation for leather sector in India	3.7.1 Assistance in designing the monitoring and evaluation system	1992/93
3.8 Senior Economist Programme in Africa	3.8.1 Evaluation report	1992

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
3.9 Use of equipment	3.9.1 Report	1992
3.10 Industrial development in Africa	3.10.1 Evaluation report	1992
3.11 Pilot exercise of enhanced divisional management	3.11.1 Contribution to the assessment	1992/93
3.12 Management support agreement impact on national capacity	3.12.1 Evaluation report	1992/93
3.13 UNDP role in joint operations as African Management Services Company, Global Environment Facility, Social Dimensions of Adjustment	3.13.1 Evaluation report	1992/93
3.14 Impact of regional, interregional and global programmes	3.14.1 Evaluation report	1993
3.15 Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals	3.15.1 Evaluation report	1992/93
3.16 Metrology	3.16.1 Evaluation report	1992
4. Evaluations of programmes funded by SPR resources but not related to the six thematic areas		
4.1 Disaster mitigation		
A1: Disaster preparedness	4.1.1 Contribution	1994
A2: Emergency relief	4.1.2 Contribution	1994
A3: Reconstruction and rehabilitation	4.1.3 Contribution	1994
A4: Refugees and displaced persons	4.1.4 Contribution	1994
4.2 Special and/or new activities		
C1: Human development report	4.2.1 Contribution	1993
C2: Special Economic plan for Central America	4.2.2 Contribution	1993
C3: UNPAAERD	4.2.3 Contribution	1993
C4: Drug abuse control	4.2.4 Contribution if requested	1994
C5: HIV/AIDS	4.2.5 Contribution	1994
C6: Social Dimensions of Adjustment	4.2.6 Contribution	1993

/...

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
C7: World Conference on Education For All	4.2.7 Contribution if requested	1994
C8: Private sector development	4.2.9 Contribution if requested	1994
C9: NGOs	4.2.8 Contribution	1993
4.3 Aid coordination		
D1: Support to Roundtable and Consultative Group meetings	4.3.1 Contribution	1993
D2: NaTCAPs	4.3.2 Contribution	1994
D3: Needs assessments and Country Programme reviews	4.3.3 Contribution	1994
D4: Country Programme initiatives	4.3.4 Contribution	1994
4.4 Programme development		
E1: Project Development Facility	4.4.1 Contribution	1994
E2: Evaluation and training	4.4.2 Contribution	1994
E3: Programme research	4.4.3 Contribution if requested	1994
4.5 Assistance to Palestinian people	4.5.1 Contribution	1994
OPERATIONAL GOALS		
5. Feedback of evaluations in programme and projects		
5.1 Development of databanks	5.1.1 Expansion of the existing databanks	1992/93
	5.1.2 Establishment of the databank on country programmes	1992
	5.1.3 Establishment of the databank on terminal reports	1992
	5.1.4 Establishment of the global database software	1992
5.2 Accessibility to the users	5.2.1 Introduction to the LAN	1992/93
	5.2.2 Training of UNDP staff	1992/1993
5.3 Dissemination of lessons	5.3.1 Programme Advisory Note on trade policy	1992
	5.3.2 Programme Advisory Note on special public work programme	1992

/...

GOALS	OUTPUTS	DEADLINE
	5.3.3 Issues of "FINDINGS"	1992/93
	5.3.4 Issues of "FEEDBACK"	1992/93
6. Direct support to Regional Bureaux	6.1 Backstopping activities Review of terms of reference Briefing and debriefing of consultants Inter-bureau working group Project Appraisal Committees	1992/93
EXTERNAL RELATIONS		
7. Relationships with donors, recipient countries, Governing Council and Agencies		
7.1 Accountability of the Administrator	7.1.1 Reports to the Governing Council	1992/93
7.2 Relationships with United Nations agencies	7.2.1 Papers for the Inter Agency Working Group	1992/93
7.3 Relations with DAC expert group	7.3.1 Papers for DAC meetings	1992/93
7.4 Joint evaluations	7.4.1 With donors	1992/93
	7.4.2 With agencies	1992/93